REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 6-7, 11 and 12 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 6-7, 11 and 12 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 6, 11, and 12 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 6, 7, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,869 to Sakai et al. (Sakai). Applicant traverses the rejection via amendment and argument.

Claims 6, 11 and 12 are amended to clarify that each node that reserved a fraction of bandwidth transmits the token to a next node that reserved a fraction of bandwidth in the sequence in parallel such that each node of the network follows circulation of the token. Thus, aspects of the invention include that only nodes that have actually reserved bandwidth transmit the token to other nodes that also reserved bandwidth. Support for this amendment is found on pages 6 and 7 of the as-filed application.

Another aspect of the invention in pending independent Claims 6, 11 and 12 is that a master node transmits, to each node, a table storing a sequence defining a chronological order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth during a cycle. Thus, each node receives a table from the master node that contains the sequence of passage for the token. This table transmission from the master node to all nodes occurs regardless of whether the receiving node reserved bandwidth or not.

Page 6 of the present Office Action states:

"Examiner interpreted the amended claimed subject matter "transmits to each node a second table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth" as "rewrites the contents of the Isochronous data communication token management table according to bandwidths required in the communication between stations, and sequentially sends out the tokens for each certain time so that only specified stations can transmit/receive data. ..", "it creates a new token packet management table .... "; col. 5, lines 50 - 61, col. 6, lines 10 - 22, col. 27, lines 30 - 45; Fig. 3, col. 27, lines 33 - 45."

Applicant respectfully disagrees that a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth is taught by Sakai based on the actual teaching of Sakai as described below.

Applicant notes that cited col. 5, lines 50-61 of Sakai states:

"In accordance with the tenth aspect, the master station includes a token management table for Isochronous data communication in which the overall band of the bus is previously sectioned into certain bands. When performing Isochronous data communication between stations, it rewrites the contents of the Isochronous data communication token management table according to bandwidths required in the communication between stations, and sequentially *sends out the tokens* for each certain time so that only specified stations can transmit/receive data. This facilitates management of the tokens and control of the transmission band in the master station." (Sakai, col. 5, lines 50-61)

Applicant notes that although the master station does rewrite "…the contents of the isochronous data communication token management table according to bandwidths required in the communication between stations, and sequentially *sends out the tokens*…", the master station of Sakai does not transmit a table to each node that stores the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a

fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims because Sakai sends the token itself and Sakai does not transmit the token management table. This is in contrast to the pending claims which recite a master node that transmits a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network that reserved a fraction of bandwidth.

Applicant notes that cite col. 6, lines 10-22 of Sakai states:

"According to a twelfth aspect, in the tenth aspect, the master station has a token management table for Asynchronous data communication separately from the Isochronous data communication token management table, wherein *the master station outputs a token* for Asynchronous data communication for each certain time to perform Asynchronous data communication between stations.

In accordance with the twelfth aspect, since Asynchronous data communication can be performed as well for each certain time, management of the tokens and control of the transmission band for Isochronous data communication can be performed easily." (Sakai, col. 6, lines 10-22)

Applicant notes that although Sakai teaches a "*master station outputs a token* for Asynchronous data communication for each certain time to perform Asynchronous data communication between stations…" and that for Sakai, "In accordance with the twelfth aspect, since Asynchronous data communication can be performed as well for each certain time", Sakai fails to teach a master node that transmits a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network that reserved a fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims. This is true because Sakai teaches sending the token itself; Sakai does not teach transmitting the token management table.

Applicant notes that cited col. 27, lines 30 - 45 of Sakai states:

"Since the communication of the data packet (Asyn) based on this token packet (Asyn) 700 and operation of the master station 11a which has received the Asynchronous data (FIG. 3; Steps S307-S309) are the same as those described above, they are not described, and Step S310 is described next.

Similarly to the operation explained above, on the basis of the status information of the slave station 11c collected with this token packet (Asyn) 700, the CPU portion 21a assigns a bandwidth corresponding to the request (Step S310). *It includes, in the above-stated another storage region, a table format similar to the token packet (Iso) management table 1502,* and *it creates a new token packet (Iso) management table 1504*, as shown in FIG. 18. Furthermore, in Step S310, the CPU 21a *updates the token packet (Iso) management table 1502 currently stored in the token table management portion 233a to the new token packet (Iso) management table 1503 created as explained above and stored in the other storage region."* (Sakai, Col. 25 lines 30-45).

Applicant notes that although Sakai teaches that the CPU 21a of the master node updates and even creates a new table in the storage region of the master node, neither the token packet management table 1502 nor the new token packet management table 1504 is transmitted to all nodes in the Sakai system. Sakai fails to teach a master node that transmits a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network that reserved a fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims. Once again, this is true because Sakai teaches sending the token itself; Sakai does not teach transmitting the token management table.

Figure 3 of Sakai is also cited on the Office Action page 6 as supporting the contention that a Saki teaches transmitting a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network that reserved a fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims. However, Applicant respectfully

disagrees based on the content and description of Figure 3. Although tokens themselves are transferred in Figure 3 of Sakai, Figure 3 fails to teach the transmission, by the master node to all nodes, of a table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network that reserved a fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims.

In addition to the above, other differences between the pending claims and the teaching of Sakai exist. For example, in Sakai, the bus is a ring shaped bus, where a token circulates in the same direction in the loop, where the master station sends out one token packet at a time corresponding to the next token number such that all nodes receive the token in turn. This is illustrated in Sakai col. 26 line 65 to col. 27 line 14. In the present application, the token circulates in a different order and only between the nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth, as illustrated in the tables of Figure 1.

Since Sakai does not discuss the aspect of a master node transmitting a second table storing a sequence that defines a chronological order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth, then Sakai cannot anticipate the pending amended claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 per MPEP §2131. Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of pending Claims 6, 7, 11, and 12 because these claims patentably define over the cited art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims based on the amendments and arguments presented above.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean-François Fleury
Jean-Baptiste Henry

Date: March 1, 2010

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,800
(609) 734-6451

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312